

REMARKS

In response to the pending Office Action, claims 1 and 2 have been amended, claims 5-18 have been added, and claim 4 has been canceled. No new matter has been introduced.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims as currently amended are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,891,331 (“Ashida”). With respect to canceled claim 4, this rejection is rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection for at least the following reasons.

As amended, claim 1 recites a method of manufacturing a plasma display panel, wherein a structure of the plasma display panel is formed with photolithography and wherein at least one of a display electrode, a black layer, an address electrode or a partition wall of the structures of the plasma display panel, in a process of forming the structure, is exposed using a plurality of photomasks with a same pattern and a different aperture width of a exposure part, with a different amount of exposure, an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by photomask with a longer aperture width is larger than an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by a photomask with a shorter aperture width, wherein the exposure amount is determined by exposure intensity or exposure time.

To provide context for the subject matter of claim 1, application describes on page 3, lines 20-24 that claim 1 aims at providing a manufacturing method and plasma display panel (“PDP”) manufactured therewith that suppress retroflexion, exfoliation, and the like, in the

formed structure using photolithography method. In order to achieve the same, a manufacturing method of claim 1 includes, among other features, at least one of a display electrode, a black layer, an address electrode or a partition wall of the structures of the PDP that is exposed using a plurality of photomasks with a same pattern and a different aperture width of a exposure part, with a different amount of exposure, where an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by photomask with a longer aperture width is larger than an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by the photomask with a shorter aperture width, wherein the exposure amount is determined by exposure intensity or exposure time.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims because Ashida fails to describe or suggest the above-recited feature.

Ashida describes a method for manufacturing electrodes that can effectively suppress edge-curl when metal electrodes such as bus electrodes and data electrodes are patterned by a photolithography method. Ashida at Abstract. To do so, Ashida in one implementation, describes that the PDP structure is formed using two photomasks each of which has identical exposure pattern but different aperture at manufacturing process. Ashida at col. 8, line 40 to col. 9, line 5.

To this end, Ashida is similar to the subject matter of claim 1. However, Ashida explicitly describes that the exposure of a plurality of photomasks is made with the same condition (emphasis added). Ashida at col. 8, line 53 to col. 9, line 14 (stating that exposure conditions through exposure mask (53A) and exposure mask (53B) are the same).

As such, Ashida fails to describe or suggest a method of manufacturing a PDP that includes among other features, at least one of a display electrode, a black layer, an address

electrode or a partition wall of the structures of the PDP that is exposed using a plurality of photomasks with a same pattern and a different aperture width of a exposure part, with a different amount of exposure, where an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by photomask with a longer aperture width is larger than an exposure amount radiated from the light source when the exposure is made by the photomask with a shorter aperture width, wherein the exposure amount is determined by exposure intensity or exposure time, as recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 along with its dependent claims.

Claim 2 recites features similar to the above recited features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 along with its dependent claims.

Dependent Claims

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because claims 1 and 2 is allowable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also allowable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:MaM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 3, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**